

*P. O. returns your
mail. Please give
present address.*

THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON, APRIL, 1913

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Illinois, Iowa, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women.

Forty-one Branch Committees; 18,653 members in 354 cities, towns, and villages.*

MISS MARY S. AMES, President.

MRS. J. RANDOLPH COOLIDGE,
MISS ANNA L. DAWES,
MRS. CHARLES ELIOT GUILD,
MRS. CHARLES D. HOFMAN,
MISS AGNES IRWIN,
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer,
Walnut Street, Brookline.
MISS ELIZABETH JOHNSON, Sec'y.
MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG, Cor. Sec'y.
Room 615 Kensington Building, Boston.

* Not present membership of women over 21 years of age: eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations, and removals from the state.

FACING BOTH WAYS

THE attitude of the suffragists toward temperance suggests the ancient lines:

"When the devil was sick, the devil a monk would be;
When the devil got well, the devil a monk was he."

When the suffragists have experienced a defeat, as last year in Ohio, Michigan and Wisconsin, they always insist that it was the liquor interests that defeated them. But, when a suffrage campaign is on, they are profuse in the promises and assurances which they make to these same interests. Witness the address which Mrs. Crystal Eastman Benedict made before the Manufacturers' and Dealers' Club of Milwaukee during the Wisconsin campaign, when she asked the assembled brewers: "Why all this hue and cry about woman suffrage injuring the brewing industry? Isn't it a little foolish?" Witness also the declaration of May Wright Sewall in the Milwaukee Free-Press of October 20, 1912, "Votes for women will no more prohibit drink than they will prohibit food." Witness also the following, which is reproduced, headlines and all, from the conspicuous place which it occupied in The Woman's Journal of August 17, 1912:

LIQUOR DEALERS WRONG
Women Vote as Individuals and not as a Class

The San Francisco Bulletin, in an editorial of July 31, says: Liquor dealers misjudged the effect of woman suffrage. When the equal suffrage constitutional amendment was an issue before the people it had no more bitter opponents than the liquor dealers of California. In fact, most of the money spent in that campaign came from liquor interests. The amendment has now been a part of the law of California for more than half a year. The women have voted at many saloon-closing and saloon-regulating elections, and in no instance have they, as a class, stood solidly against the liquor traffic. Plainly, the liquor dealers who fought the equal suffrage amendment were mistaken. They overlooked an obvious truth, which is that women have minds of their own and are no more likely to be unanimous on a public issue than men.

SPECIAL PRIVILEGES WANTED

THE New York Sun, ardent advocate of woman suffrage though it is, speaks sharply with reference to the inconsistencies of the suffragists. Commenting on the announcement that the legislature of California had amended the registration laws in order to relieve women voters of the necessity of having their ages recorded, the Sun says:

Only a few weeks ago an election for or against saloons was decided in favor of the latter chiefly by the votes of women in Los Angeles, thus repeating the decision of the electorate of the entire State in 1911, when 82,000 votes sustained the saloons against 31,000 protesting against them. Such a result in a state in which women claim the preponderance tends to dampen the ardor of those who enthusiastically support suffrage.—Now comes another shock to those well wishers of suffrage who claim equal rights without regard to sex influences. Why a woman who is sensible enough to desire ardently to bear her share of the government should object to the registration laws, which for obvious reasons have always required a statement of the age of the voter, is a puzzle.

It really is no puzzle, as The Sun will conclude if it gives attention to the conduct of the suffragists. They clamor for "equal rights" but they have no intention of giving up their special privileges. They want to vote and to legislate and to assist in ruling the state, on the same footing as men; but they want also to retain the deference and courtesy which civilized man has always paid them. Every one knows that the registration laws are necessary as a protection against impersonation and fraudulent voting, but all that counts for nothing if they conflict with the traditional reluctance of women to disclose their age.

AS TO "SEX DISCRIMINATION"

READERS of the October REMONSTRANCE may recall the article relating to the protection of girls, quoted from The Woman's Journal in that number. The postal authorities, having become aware that the privileges of the general delivery mail window in the large cities were being abused, and that flighty and thoughtless young women were there receiving letters from men which they were not willing to have sent to their homes, gave general instructions to stop the practice

by inquiring the home addresses of the young women applying for letters at the general delivery window and their reasons for not receiving their mail at their homes.

The Woman's Journal, it will be remembered, instead of approving this measure for the protection of girls against the perils of city life, expressed indignation that girls and young women should be subject to such a discrimination. Why should young men, it insisted, be allowed to receive mail at the general delivery window when girls were debarred from the privilege? The Woman's Journal could see nothing in the post-office order but "sex discrimination."

Now another form of "sex discrimination" is the subject of suffrage criticism. A member of the Denver Board of Aldermen introduced a bill making it a misdemeanor for the proprietors of cafés to serve women patrons with intoxicating liquors. Thereupon the Woman's Public Service League sent to the Board of Aldermen the following formal protest:

"The Woman's Public Service League hereby protests against the passage of any measure of this character, against any measure which places restrictions upon the freedom of action of women which are not placed upon the freedom of action of men, and we respectfully request your honorable body to defeat any measure of this character which may be presented."

The first instance seems to show that the suffragists think it better that young girls in the cities should go to the bad than that they should be protected by measures not extended to young men; and the second instance suggests a suffragist conviction that it is better that women should have the privilege of promiscuous drinking and intoxication with men in saloons with all the attendant moral perils than that they should receive any "discriminating" protection.

THE SCHOOL VOTE

SUFFRAGISTS are quite apt to lose their tempers when any reference is

made to the small number of women in Massachusetts who vote for school committee.

Yet when full suffrage for women is demanded, it certainly is pertinent to ask how many women care about and make use of the privilege of school suffrage which they have had for more than thirty years.

Light is thrown on this question by some figures collected by Dr. Hartwell, Secretary of the Statistical Department of the city of Boston, and published in the Boston Globe of January 19, 1913.

In the whole state, in 1910, out of 354 cities and towns, there were 174, or nearly half of the whole number, in which not a woman voted.

This year, the issue in Boston was one which appealed to women and should have drawn out an exceptionally large women's vote. It was felt that a woman should be elected to the School Committee, which had no women in its membership. Miss Curtis, an exceptionally well qualified woman, had been nominated and her election earnestly advocated on this ground. Yet the number of women who voted was actually smaller than in any election, with a single exception, for 26 years. In 25 wards,—omitting Hyde Park, which voted for the first time as a part of Boston—the vote cast by women was only 4,887 or 8,642 below the average for the 12 preceding elections. So meagre was women's share in the election that every woman who voted might have stayed at home, and Miss Curtis would have been elected by the votes of men. So keenly did Miss Curtis herself feel the apathy of the suffragists that, in an interview in the Boston Herald, January 6, eight days before the election, she said:

"It seems to me it has been an excellent opportunity for the suffragists to urge women to show an interest and to make the most of what opportunities they have. They have not done anything about the matter because they are not campaigning in favor of any candidate. But it would not be necessary for them to support either

candidate. If they would only drum up an interest in the subject on the part of women who have the right to vote, but are apathetic, they could still maintain their independent attitude and would be doing an excellent work."

Dr. Hartwell's conclusion that the returns show that "the school suffrage is but slightly estimated, both by the women at large and the women who register" is abundantly justified by these facts.

THIS YEAR'S RESULTS

FROM the boastfulness of the suffragists, it might be inferred that they had had their own way in most of the legislatures this winter. The contrary is true. Suffrage amendments have been acted on favorably in New York, New Jersey and Iowa, but in each of these states they have to run the gauntlet of a second legislature. The only states besides Michigan in which final legislative action has been taken are Nevada, Montana, and the two Dakotas. In these states the question will be submitted at the polls in November, 1914. In North Dakota, a majority of all the votes cast at the election is necessary to adoption. The legislatures of Massachusetts, Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Indiana, Arkansas, Delaware, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Texas and West Virginia have defeated proposed suffrage amendments or other suffrage measures.

NO IMPROVEMENT OF CONDITIONS

(From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post, Jan. 27, 1913)

We have looked into this matter carefully and have studied the conditions in the states where women have voted for years. It must be confessed that no person true to the facts disclosed in those states can claim that there has been improvement in political and social conditions as compared with states where the franchise is still limited. It is true that the women of those states have obtained certain legislation, but that legislation was no more than they secured in Connecticut, for example, years ago, without even the shadow of a vote.

SUFFRAGE AGAIN DEFEATED IN MASSACHUSETTS

The legislative Committee on Constitutional Amendments gave a hearing at the State House, February 26, upon petitions asking for an amendment to the Constitution striking the word "male" from the qualifications for voters. It was perhaps significant that the Massachusetts Branch of the American Federation of Labor, which presented petitions and was represented by counsel and by speakers at the hearings last year and the year previous took no part in the movement this year. The petitions this year were from the Socialists and from Miss Blackwell and other suffragists. At the hearing, which lasted all day, with an adjournment for dinner, the Socialists were heard first; and Dr. Harriet L. Clark, who represented them, explained that the Socialists had always stood for woman suffrage since the inception of their party. Miss Theresa Crowley conducted the case for the suffragists, and Louis D. Brandeis, Joseph Walker, Prof. A. B. Hart, ex-Congressman Powers and Mrs. Josephine Preston Peabody Marks were among the speakers in favor of the petitioners. Ex-Senator George L. Barnes, senior counsel for the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women, conducted the case for the remonstrants.

Not "Lazy Parasites."

Mrs. A. J. George of Brookline, Secretary of the Organization Committee of the Massachusetts Association, who spoke first for the remonstrants, denied that the anti-suffragists are a minority of "lazy parasites," as they had just been described by one of the Socialist speakers. They are a strong majority of the self-respecting women of the state who feel that women can go on with their work for humanity more effectively without the ballot. She pointed out the fact that, out of 7,000,000 women in industry in this country, only 23 per cent are in factories, while 40 per cent are in domestic service, where women certainly may help them without the vote.

Why is it? asked Mrs. George, that the suffragists always oppose a referendum to women on this question? In all other matters, they say: Let both men and women vote; but on this fundamental question affecting women vitally, they oppose the women's vote. Mrs. George directed attention to the

Massachusetts laws providing exemptions for women not granted to men. These laws women have gained without the vote; and if they had the vote they would lose their right to special legislation.

Suffrage States Lagging Behind

Miss Minnie Bronson, Organizing Secretary of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, and formerly a special agent of the United States Bureau of Labor, gave a detailed study of industrial legislation affecting women and children; and showed conclusively that in the male suffrage states wage-earning women are better protected than wage-earning men, and that the woman suffrage states, instead of being in the van, have usually lagged behind and enacted protective laws only after male suffrage states have pointed the way. She drew attention to the small majorities by which suffrage had been adopted in the suffrage states as showing that, even in those states there had been no general demand from women for the vote; and she quoted an official of the National Woman Suffrage Association as claiming only 3,000,000 women,—some of them undoubtedly minors—as "sympathetically allied" with the suffrage movement in the whole country, out of a female population of voting age of approximately 23,000,000.

The Duty of Legislators

Hon. Arthur H. Wellman, the next speaker, devoted himself to answering the specious plea that legislators, no matter what their own views may be, ought not to prevent a proposed constitutional amendment from being submitted to the people. He quoted from the address to the people by the Constitutional Convention of 1820 which framed the provisions for amendment this explanation of their intention: "We propose that whenever two-thirds of the House of Representatives and a majority of the Senate in two successive legislatures *shall determine that any specific amendment is expedient* such proposed amendment shall be submitted to the people." Clearly these provisions were intended to prevent absolutely any Senator or Representative from voting to submit an amendment to the people unless he was himself firmly convinced that the amendment was for the public good. The very form of the resolve now before the Legislature, beginning "that it is expedient to alter the Constitution" etc., is to the same effect. Cer-

tainly no member of the Legislature who conscientiously considers his duty can vote for an amendment to the Constitution simply to learn how the voters feel on the question. If he wants to test public sentiment on this question there is a perfectly proper and constitutional method for doing it, and a bill for that purpose is now pending before this legislature.

Need of Conserving Womanhood

Professor William T. Sedgwick, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, urged the need of conserving the precious qualities of womanhood. Woman suffrage, by tempting women to enter public life, by leading them into partisan contests and laying upon them obligations remote from home and the home life, will inevitably make them less womanly and less efficient members of the body politic. This is not social conservation, it is social waste. Men and women are fundamentally different, with different natural aptitudes and duties, and any movement which aims at identity of function between the sexes is both unnatural and vain. That the woman suffrage movement is a revolution, not an evolution,—a backward, not a forward movement—is indicated by the fact that, in England, women have degenerated, through emotional devotion to the suffrage, from ladies into female ruffians, throwing bombs, burning buildings, and otherwise behaving like degenerates.

Small Demand for Women's Ballot

Truman R. Hawley, Esq., junior counsel for the Association, presented carefully prepared statistics of women's school vote in Massachusetts, showing how small is the demand for women's ballot. There are 354 towns and cities in Massachusetts. Of these, there were last year 159 in which no woman voted, 88 in which only from 1 to 10 women voted, and 304 in which the number of women voting was less than 50. In Boston, where the census shows 217,888 women of voting age, only 4,939 voted last year. In the 33 cities of the state combined, only 6.6 per cent of the women of voting age registered and 5 per cent voted last year. In the 321 towns, only 5.6 per cent of the women of voting age registered and only 1.4 per cent voted. These figures show that an overwhelming majority of the women in this state do not want or ask for the ballot. A grave responsibility rests upon members of the Legislature who, by their votes, would express their willingness to imperil the Common-

wealth by the enfranchisement of a great body of citizens who are indifferent or hostile to the imposition upon them of the duties of the suffrage.

No Injustice Shown to Women

Mr. Barnes, the closing speaker for the remonstrants, argued that the restrictions thrown about the electorate in Massachusetts are designed to secure sufficient intelligence, sufficient interest, and sufficient power to enforce whatever action is determined on. The Legislature should not remove any of these restrictions unless it is satisfied either that the restriction works an injustice to a great number of citizens or an entire class of citizens, or that a great number of citizens desire its removal. No injustice whatever to women of the State as a class has been shown, no law which they as a class demand has failed of enactment. It is evident that the great majority of the women do not want the burden of suffrage imposed on them, and it is clear that the men do not desire to impose this burden on them unless they want it. If the Legislature wants to ascertain the sentiment of the men and women of the State upon this question, it should clearly be done by a referendum vote, not by a constitutional amendment.

Adversely Reported.

March 6, by a vote of 7 to 4, the Committee on Constitutional Amendments reported adversely upon the woman suffrage resolve.

The Resolve Substituted.

March 13, the House of Representatives, by a vote of 127 to 70, with 13 pairs, substituted the resolve for the adverse report of the Committee.

The Resolve Defeated.

March 25, on the third reading, when a two-thirds vote is required, the House defeated the resolve by a vote of 144 in favor to 88 opposed. The vote in the affirmative fell 32 short of the required two-thirds.

Other Suffrage Bills Adversely Reported.

The Committee on Election Laws reported unanimously against a bill proposing to give women the right to vote upon the license question. The Committee also reported adversely upon the so-called "Drury bill," which proposed to submit the question of the expediency of giving full suffrage to women to a referendum of the male voters of the state, and also to the vote of women qualified to vote for school committee.

THE TORCH AND THE BOMB

JANUARY 27th, the Speaker of the House of Commons having ruled that the proposed woman suffrage amendments to the pending Franchise bill so affected the substance of the bill as to make it practically a new bill, which must be introduced as such, Mr. Asquith, explaining that the ruling took the Government by surprise, withdrew the bill. He promised that, at the next session, an adequate share of the Government's time would be given to a private member's bill, so framed as not to exclude amendments embodying different suffrage proposals.

Irritated by this disappointment, and charging the Government with breaking its promises, the militant suffragettes entered upon a campaign of violence, some of the incidents in which are briefly summarized elsewhere in THE REMONSTRANCE. This campaign, encouraged and directed by Mrs. Pankhurst, culminated in the dynamiting of Lloyd-George's house and the burning of the pavilion at Kew Palace.

Brought to trial for inciting the dynamiting of Lloyd-George's house, Mrs. Pankhurst declared: "I repudiate the right of the legal authorities over whose appointment, because I am a woman, I have no control, to try me." That is to say, a woman may commit any sort of crime in England, and it is not right that the courts shall try her. Mrs. Pankhurst, personally, has promised to stop short of murder; but logically her argument would apply to that crime as to others.

The effect produced upon wiser suffragists is significant. John Burns, president of the local government board and an ardent suffragist, describes the Pankhurst policy as a "tyranny of organized blackguardism." Mrs. Millicent Fawcett, president of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies, declares that the crimes of the militant suffragettes "would be excusable only among savages, and are really a serious menace to civilization."

From American papers known to be

in sympathy with the suffrage cause come words of frank condemnation. The Springfield Republican says that the Pankhurst rioters have "descended to the mob level;" the New York Evening Post characterizes the blowing up of the Lloyd-George house as "the climax of the series of foolish and wicked acts committed by the Pankhurst group of militant suffragettes;" and the Boston Transcript says that Mrs. Pankhurst and her followers, "in their excess of hysteria, long ago descended to the plane of ordinary law-breakers and should have been dealt with as such."

THE REAL HITCH

(Edward S. Martin in The Ladies Home Journal for March, 1913)

When Mrs. Belmont says that the Constitution should represent the will of all the people, not one half, she forgets, no doubt, that our Constitution is acceptable enough to most of the women as well as to the men.... And when Mrs. Belmont says that "a document that divides the people by the arbitrary line of sex is not in touch with modern growth," where is she? That was the way the Creator divided the people, and if He is not in touch with modern growth, it behooves modern growth to connect with Him at its early convenience. Until it does, it will not prosper. Right there, or thereabouts, is the real hitch in Mrs. Belmont's program. She thinks that when women get the vote they are going to be different. "As a whole" she says "women will some day emerge from the mere physical sex facts that now hinder them.".... I guess not. Women have been women a long time, and their physical sex facts are not an invention on which the patent seems about to expire.

CAN SHE?

(Harriet L. Peckham, in Holland's Magazine for March)

Many women are eager for the ballot because they have children to bring up. My children are very dear to me, yet their father loves them too. He works long hours to make living conditions comfortable for them. He tries to give them advantages and pleasures which he never had. Can I do more by taking time from household duties and motherly care, in order to study politics and learn how to vote wisely?

Reprinted by permission from the Boston Herald.—Copyright 1913, E. W. Kemble.



THE MILITANT SUFFRAGETTE

FROM WINDOW-SMASHING TO ARSON AND DYNAMITING

The Rapid Progress of the Pankhurst Suffragettes

January 28. Thirty militants were arrested in London for window smashing at the Treasury, the Post Office and other public buildings, and in shops.

January 29. At the Vere-st. Post Office, London, and at East Croydon and at York, packets addressed to Mr. Lloyd-George and to Mr. Asquith, burst into flames on being exposed to the air. They contained glass tubes of liquids.

January 31. A militant was arrested for breaking with an iron bar the glass case containing the Insignia of the Order of Merit in the Jewel Room of the Tower of London. She explained that she did the damage as a protest against the Government, "who promised women votes, and had not kept their word."

January 31. Four golf courses in the Birmingham district were seriously damaged: the words "Votes for Women" being cut into the turf in

large letters, and an acid poured into the ground destroying the grass.

On the 3d of February, Mrs. Pankhurst, speaking in London, said she liked the golf course departure very much, and she congratulated their soldiers who had undertaken that particular campaign and the success which had attended it. She thought it was extremely ingenious and effective. By acting as they had done they were injuring no human being—they were actually providing more employment for a good many. It was no use men being angry with them for damaging the links; it was no use clamoring that the women should be punished, and asking for the links to be protected. All these things might be given them, but still they would not be safe, and the only way to get safety was for men to arouse themselves and tell the Government to give women the vote, in order to preserve their golf links from injury. They had found a very vulnerable spot.

January 31. A suffragette named Melford was arrested for bombarding London shop windows with heavy leaden disks thrown from a

catapult, from the top of an omnibus.

February 1. The telegraph wires between Glasgow and London were cut, and the fuse-boxes in connection with the underground communications were blown up. For several hours, communication by telegraph between the two cities was cut off.

February 1. Two orchid houses at Kew Gardens were broken into, and about \$5,000 worth of valuable plants were destroyed. In one of the houses was found a paper inscribed "Orchids can be destroyed, but not woman's honor."

February 5. The refreshment rooms at Regent's Park were burned down. Roughly scratched in the gravel path surrounding the building were the words "Votes for Women."

February 5. At Dundee, while a postman was emptying a bag of letters from various pillar-boxes, on the sorting table at the Central Post Office, the letters burst into flame, and in trying to extinguish the fire, four men were seriously burned. Long tubes containing phosphorus

THE REMONSTRANCE.

and another chemical were found among the letters. These were enclosed in long envelopes addressed "The Right Hon. H. H. Asquith—Justice to Women."

February 14. Two militants, waving banners with "Votes for Women" on them were ejected from St. Paul's Cathedral, for creating a disturbance while memorial services in tribute to Captain Scott, the Antarctic explorer, were in progress.

February 14. Sylvia Pankhurst, with Zelig Emerson, an American, and others were brought into the police court in London for smashing shop windows. The police officer testified that Zelig Emerson kicked and struck him when he arrested her. She was sentenced to six weeks, and Miss Pankhurst, to two months in jail, in default of the payment of a fine.

February 18. Sylvia Pankhurst was arrested, the third time in two weeks, for smashing windows. The first two times she was given the option of a fine, and the fines were paid by some person unknown. This time she was sentenced to two months hard labor, without the option of a fine.

February 19. The unoccupied and partly-completed country residence of David Lloyd-George, Chancellor of the Exchequer, was destroyed by a powerful bomb. The walls of the house were split in all directions, and most of the rooms were wrecked. "General" Mrs. Flora Drummond, one of Mrs. Pankhurst's lieutenants, declared: "I think it is grand. It was a fine act successfully carried out." Mrs. Pankhurst admitted that she was responsible for the explosion. Speaking at Cardiff February 20, she said: "We have blown up the Chancellor of the Exchequer's house"; and speaking at Chelsea, on the 21st, she twitted the authorities for being afraid to take advantage of her assumption of responsibility for the act, and declared that, short of taking human life, the militant suffragettes intended to do everything possible to settle, once for all, the political status of the women of the country. On the 24th, Mrs. Pankhurst was arrested on the charge of inciting persons to commit malicious damage to property. On the 26th, she was committed for trial, and on the 27th was released on bail, after promising not to participate personally in the militant

suffragette movement pending her trial.

February 20. The restaurant pavilion in the Botanical Gardens around Kew Palace was set on fire and destroyed by two militants at 3 A.M. The women, Lillian Lenton and Joyce Locke, were caught as they were trying to escape. When brought into the police court, Miss Locke threw law-books at the head of the judge and the two were half-carried out of the court-room, screaming defiance and shouting that they would die before they would submit to "man made laws."

February 23. Suffragists cut five signal telegraph wires on the Great Western Railway at night. A note with the words "Votes for women" was found on one of the wires.

March 7. A suffragist named Ella Stevenson was sentenced to 9 months' imprisonment in the Central Criminal Court at London for placing tubes filled with fluid phosphorus in a letter box.

March 14. Militants raided the Richmond district at night, and disfigured many residences by obliterating names on gate-posts and daubing the houses with tar and paint.

March 17. Militant suffragettes invaded a non-militant suffrage rally at Gateshead, which Mr. Philip Snowden was addressing, and were ejected after creating a disturbance.

March 17. A London meeting which Mrs. Pankhurst was addressing was so aroused by her speech that it broke out in shouts of "Why don't you blow up Premier Asquith?" and "Shoot him."

March 20. "Arson squads" of militant suffragettes burned the fine country residence of Lady Amy White, widow of Field Marshal Sir George White, at Englefield Green. The great mansion was completely destroyed. Papers inscribed "Votes for women" and "Stop torturing our comrades" were found in the grounds.

A WELL KNOWN man in Detroit was approached recently by an ardent suffragist who deplored existing conditions in the city schools. "Things are in a dreadful state" she said, "but give women the ballot, and we shall see a change." "But, Madam," he said, "women have the school ballot now." "I didn't know that," she said; "how long have they had it?" "Sixteen years," he replied.

OFFICE HOLDING FOR WOMEN

To the Editor of THE REMONSTRANCE:

May not we, who protest against the further extension of the franchise to women, reasonably lay stress upon a danger to the sex which will probably be one of its results, namely the increased holding of public office by women? If those who desire it, obtain Woman Suffrage, will this not come as a natural consequence? Will those women who are not satisfied that men should choose their representatives and law-makers, be content to be exclusively represented and governed by them? Shall we not see many women strive for entrance and enter into public and political life and all that it involves for brain and body? Will they not squander and dissipate in combat with man and the usurpation of many of his functions, the strength and force which should be used for what we believe to be the real object of their existence?

For we, even as the suffragists, have our ideal for woman. We believe that she has her great work to do for the human race, but, along the lines laid down for her from the Creation. We believe that it is her part to influence and educate both man and woman towards an ever more unselfish, nobler and more spiritual conception of life. We believe that, unaided by the franchise, she can do this for her unenlightened brother and her overburdened sister. We believe that her spheres, in these days of wider opportunities, are not only in the home, but in the office, the department-store, and the factory also. We believe that if each true woman, standing where nature or the necessities of living have placed her, will use her powers and opportunities thoughtfully and without prejudice, man can be trusted more and more surely by her, faithfully to perform his great part in the guidance of civilization and the uplifting of society.

Since we believe this and that the right to vote and the duty of voting will add too heavily to the life-work of the conscientious woman, the world over, how much more overpowering must we consider the burden to be laid upon her inadequate body and brain, if she is to be called upon to take a place in the strenuous battle of public and political life.

—Jane Dexter.

"SOMETHING MORE?"

"Is this new freedom of women to mean merely a large numerical addition to the voting list, or something more?" asks one of the most brilliant and conspicuous of the younger suffragist leaders, in a recent magazine article.

Anti-suffragists have always predicted that "something more" was meant. Anti-suffragists have always felt that the logical result of the woman suffrage movement must be to minimize the differences between women and men—"accept sex as an incident," as a St. Louis suffragist has lately urged—to encourage an increasing number of ambitious, ill-poised women toward individual "careers," and to weaken the significance of woman's unique service to the home and the race.

To many suffragists these fears have seemed ridiculous. As hearty home-lovers themselves as any anti-suffragist, the home has seemed to them impregnable. They have sincerely believed that woman might assume the ballot without appreciable change in her relations to child or husband. Confronted by definite statements to the contrary from leaders of their movement, they have waved them aside as casual utterances, theories never intended for practice.

English feminists of the standing of Mrs. Teresa Billington-Greig, whose contributions to American newspapers are beginning to be widely read, have said plainly that "sex equality is antagonistic to wife maintenance," and that "the burden which equality must bring is the burden of economic maintenance," but the rank and file of suffragists, apparently, still suppose "economic independence" to imply nothing more than knowing how to earn one's living before marriage and exacting from one's husband a fixed share of his earnings after. "Parasite" seems to them a convenient epithet to hurl at an "anti," but not one that by any chance could be applied to themselves.

For years Mrs. Charlotte Perkins

Gilman has been urging women to "come out of their little monogamous harems," teaching that "the woman should have as much to do in the home as the man—no more," promising that "when *all* women are engaged in industrial occupations, the conditions of industry will be compelled to suit the conditions of maternity," and explaining that "if the child is not seriously ill, the nurse is as good as the mother, and if the child is seriously ill, the nurse is better," but her words have seemed too preposterous to be taken seriously.

But a younger leader, Mrs. Rheta Childe Dorr, asked whether married women should work outside their homes, has said: "Personally, I believe that the wife of the future will be self-supporting, even if her wages frequently come from the State in payment for giving it citizens."

And now comes Miss Inez Milholland, and sounds a bold, clear, compelling note:

"Is this sudden liberation of an entire sex going to mean a revolution of a new and bewildering kind, touching and changing life at every point? . . . The situation is confused by the fact that a large proportion of the new voters are women of the old types, bred to another standard. . . . Many are of the parasitic sort, naturally conservative, clinging to the conditions that maintain them in idleness or partial idleness. . . . But it will certainly not be long before the steady influx to the voting ranks of those millions of younger women whose impressions are being formed in the more alert, stirring air of to-day. . . . will bring the real issues more sharply before us. . . . The institutions most certain to be touched and changed are the home and marriage itself. . . . There is no blinking the fact that we cannot liberate woman without ultimately finding ourselves facing radical changes in her relations with man as regards the two vital matters of property and sex. . . . Many of them, naturally, shrink from such radical thoughts. *But to expect that they can change these vital relations and still leave them as they were, is to expect too much.*"

Anti-suffragists believe that utterances like these justify their misgivings. They believe that the home of

the American ideal—the husband responsible for its maintenance and the wife for its care—provides a better environment for childhood and a surer guarantee of the quality of the coming generation than any substitute yet suggested. And many of them believe that, of all the influences undermining the home, none are more insidious than the propaganda of woman suffrage.

ANTI-SUFFRAGE AT WASHINGTON

As was explained by Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, President of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, it was with great reluctance that that Association appeared at Washington a few days before the inauguration of President Wilson. For 125 years, the inauguration of a President of the United States had been conducted without any attempt to use that event for the furtherance of political propaganda. It remained for women who promise by their votes to show a more excellent way in government, to convert a time of serious dignity into spectacular parades. It was as a protest against this method of procedure that the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage established itself at Washington to direct public attention to some of the arguments against the enfranchisement of woman.

The results fully justified this determination. The headquarters at 1305 F Street were thronged with people anxious to buy anti-suffrage badges and literature. One day, in two hours 600 persons gave their signatures as members of the Association. In a single forenoon, \$80 worth of anti-suffrage buttons were sold, and they were to be seen everywhere. On the afternoon of February 28, the Belasco Theatre was crowded to its utmost capacity at an anti-suffrage meeting, and hundreds of persons were turned away for lack of room. Mrs. Dodge presided and made the opening address; the other speakers were Mrs. John Martin of New York, Miss Lucy Price of Cleveland, and Miss Minnie Bronson. Their arguments were greeted with enthusiastic applause; and, beyond occasional shouts of "Votes for Women" from a group of suffragists in the balcony there was no disturbance.

NOTES ON SUFFRAGE AND ANTI-SUFFRAGE

MRS. PHILIP SNOWDEN, the well-known English suffragist lecturer, is reported by the Brooklyn Standard-Union of January 19th as saying, in a lecture in that city the evening before: "Suffragists and political women in the United Kingdom do not number more than 400,000. The important question is how the others of the thirteen millions of women will vote." Another important question would seem to be: "Why should the ballot be thrust upon thirteen millions of women when only 400,000 ask for it?"

MISS BLACKWELL, writing editorially in *The Woman's Journal* for March 1st, admits that the form which the indignation of the English militants takes,—namely, arson and dynamite—is "to be regretted" but adds by way of apology that "it does not compare in violence with the actions of men agitating for self-government, from the French Revolution down." Until Mrs. Pankhurst and her followers, therefore, exceed the savage ferocity of the French Commune, they are apparently safe against criticism by Miss Blackwell.

THE 11th of February was noteworthy as the date of the first large social function of the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women, and of the first large public meeting of the Association in Boston. In the afternoon, at Hotel Somerset, six hundred women from all parts of the State were seated at luncheon. Many more tickets could have been sold, had the size of the room permitted. In the absence of Miss Mary S. Ames, President of the Association, Mrs. James M. Codman received the guests informally and presided at the luncheon, introducing the speakers, and prefacing their addresses by a statement of the growth of the Association, which began its work with six members and now has more than 18,000 members in 354 cities, towns and villages. The speakers were Miss Alice

Hill Chittenden, President of the New York Association Opposed to Woman's Suffrage, and ex-Senator George L. Barnes of Weymouth.

IN THE evening, Ford Hall was filled at a public meeting held under the auspices of the Boston Branch of the Association. Hon. John A. Sullivan, Chairman of the Boston Finance Commission, presided and introduced the speakers,—Miss Minnie Bronson, formerly special agent of the department of commerce and labor, Washington, and Mr. Frederick P. Fish, chairman of the Massachusetts State Board of Education. Groups of suffragists and Socialists, who had come to the hall with the obvious intention of creating disorder, interrupted Miss Bronson frequently, but could not prevent her from completing her address.

A BUSINESS WOMAN'S VIEW

HOLLAND's Magazine, published at Dallas, Texas, prints in its March number the anti-suffrage essay which won the prize in a competition which it instituted last October for the best presentation of the reasons why women do or do not want to vote. The writer is a Texas woman, Bert Rowe, and she presents the business woman's view. Here is an extract:

"Not long since, a friend of my girlhood, who had spent the years since her marriage in hotels and select boarding houses, began a discussion of the suffrage question.

'What' she exclaimed in surprise, 'do you mean to say that a woman of your broad experience and worldly knowledge is not a suffragette?'

I replied emphatically that I was not. 'Then never let any one know it' she said, 'for all the intelligent women I have met,—all the *thinking* women are suffragettes.'

'You mean these women you have met in the hotels and boarding-houses?' I asked.

'Yes.'

'Had they any homes?' I pursued. 'Why, of course not, or they wouldn't have been boarding.'

'Had they any children?'

'Well,' she hesitated, 'very few had. You see, not many places take children these days.'

'And these are the intelligent

women, the thinking women, of the country, are they?' I exclaimed. "Women who shirk the care of a home,—who shrink from the responsibility of motherhood, who take up politics as a fad or as an outlet for their nervous energy. Then God protect the ignorant ones of the land, and keep them as they are."

A DIFFERENCE OF OPINION

One of the boons for women promised by suffragists is a shorter working day. Much is made of this in the suffrage pamphlet entitled "The Truth About Wage-Earning Women and the State" and in other suffrage literature.

But there is another side to this question. Writing in the *Hartford Times* of February 22, Marion Marsden-Dyson of South Glastonbury, Conn., who is both a wage-earner and a suffragist, protests vigorously against the Kenyon bill in Congress, which provides an eight-hour work-day for women workers throughout the country, and forbids railroads engaged in interstate commerce to accept goods from any concern violating this provision.

This wage-earning woman writes that the effect of the Kenyon bill would be to entirely prevent fair competition in every trade where men and women work side by side. She says:

"Eight to twelve hours difference every week in favor of man will spell disaster for woman, no matter how capable she may be. What employer of labor would engage a woman if a man could be got to do the same work, and work eight to twelve hours more, every week? The initial outlay and overhead expenses would be the same, but how about the production? The employer who engaged men only would be able to produce cheaper goods, whereas the man who tried to employ both would be forced to the wall.... If 48 hours a week is long enough for woman, it is long enough for man: if he is allowed, by law, to toil for 54 or 56 hours, or even 60 hours a week then we must be allowed to do the same."

This is a new aspect of the demand for "equal rights" and it is one which many suffragists, who are addicted to promising everything, seem to have overlooked.